



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/930,067	08/15/2001	Shlomo Ovadia	GIC-557.1	2241

20028 7590 11/19/2002

LAW OFFICE OF BARRY R LIPSITZ  
755 MAIN STREET  
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER

DESIR, JEAN WICEL

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2614

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/930,067

Applicant(s)

OVADIA ET AL.

Examiner

Jean W. Désir

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2002 (RCE with Amendment).
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25-29 and 31-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 30 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_. 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2614

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claims 25, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pidgeon (5,850,305).

#### **Claim 25:**

the claimed "filtering said signal at the transmitter to accentuate the signal magnitude at a predetermined fixed frequency where said nonlinear distortion is expected to occur, without substantially affecting the signal magnitude at frequencies where said nonlinear distortion is not expected to occur" is disclosed, see col. 7 lines 49-51, Fig. 4 item 405, col. 1 line 66 to col. 2 line 18;

the claimed "communicating the filtered signal to said receiver; and re-filtering the filtered signal at said receiver to attenuate the signal magnitude at said fixed frequency", is disclosed, see Fig. 4 item 409, col. 6 lines 45-46, 61-63.

**Claim 29**, the apparatus claim 29 is rejected for the same reasons as the method claim 25.

Art Unit: 2614

3. **Claim 32** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ju et al "METHOD FOR ELIMINATING NARROWBAND SHORTWAVE INTERFERENCE IN UPSTREAM CHANNEL OF HFC", Electronics Letters, 30<sup>th</sup> April 1998, Vol. 34 No. 9, pages 852-854.

Ju discloses:

"a first notch filter at the transmitter having a first transfer function to provide a filtered signal having an accentuated magnitude at a fixed frequency where said nonlinear distortion is expected to occur, said filter not substantially affecting the signal magnitude at frequencies where said nonlinear distortion is not expected to occur", see the **transmitter at Fig. 1** on page 852 where a first notch filter is disclosed as claimed see also page 852, second column, second paragraph;

"a second notch filter at the receiver having a second transfer function adapted to re-filter the filtered signal to attenuate the signal magnitude at said fixed frequency", see the **receiver at Fig. 1** on page 852 where a second notch filter is disclosed as claimed;

"wherein said first transfer function is the inverse of said second transfer function", see the **transmitter at Fig. 1** on page 852 where said first transfer function is the inverse of said second transfer function as claimed.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2614

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 26, 27, 28, 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pidgeon (5,850,305), and the BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.

Claim 26:

the claimed "effects of said CSO and CTB distortions are reduced by filtering said signal at the transmitter to accentuate the signal magnitude at a first fixed frequency where said CSO distortion resides and a second fixed frequency where said CTB distortion resides, and re-filtering said signal at the receiver to attenuate the signal magnitude at said first and second fixed frequencies" is disclosed, see the rejection of claim 25 above, see also col. 5 line 56 to col. 6 line 15 where CSO and CTB distortions are further described;

the difference between the claimed invention and Pidgeon's disclosure is that "said signal is an integrally related carrier (IRC) television channel signal having composite second order (CSO) and composite triple beat (CTB) distortions present at different fixed frequencies" is not explicitly disclosed. However, this kind of signal is known in the art – as evidence see the BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION on page 3 lines 11-16 where known description of this signal is provided. Thus, an artisan would have readily recognized that a modification of the Pidgeon's disclosure in light of this well known feature would not have changed the useful purpose of Pidgeon's disclosure which is alleviating nonlinear distortion in a signal communicated from a transmitter to a receiver. Therefore, the claimed invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2614

Claim 27 is rejected for the same reasons as 26.

Claim 28:

The claimed limitations "said communication path comprises a downstream communication path in a television distribution system; said transmitter is located at a television headend; and said receiver is associated with a subscriber terminal" are not explicitly disclosed by Pidgeon. However, these claimed limitations are notoriously well known in the art - as evidence see the BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION on page 1 line 10 to page 2 line 8. Pidgeon's disclosure would have rendered the claimed invention obvious. An artisan would have readily recognized the advantages of a modification of the Pidgeon's disclosure in light of these very well known features to arrive at the claimed invention. Because this modification would result in alleviating nonlinear distortion in a signal communicated from a transmitter to a receiver.

Therefore, the claimed invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claim 31 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 28.

6. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ju et al "METHOD FOR ELIMINATING NARROWBAND SHORTWAVE INTERFERENCE IN UPSTREAM CHANNEL OF HFC", Electronics Letters, 30<sup>th</sup> April 1998, Vol. 34 No. 9, pages 852-854, and the BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.

Claim 33:

The claimed limitations "said communication path comprises a downstream communication path in a television distribution system; said transmitter is located at a

Art Unit: 2614

television headend; and said receiver is associated with a subscriber terminal" are not explicitly disclosed, verbatim, by Ju. However, these claimed limitations are notoriously well known in the art - as evidence see the BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION on page 1 line 10 to page 2 line 8. Ju's disclosure would have rendered the claimed invention obvious. An artisan would have readily recognized the advantages of a modification of the Ju's disclosure in light of these very well known features to arrive at the claimed invention. Because this modification would advantageously result in significantly reducing noise in a television distribution system using hybrid fiber/coax (HFC) network. Therefore, the claimed invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed on Oct. 22, 2002, have been fully considered but are moot in view of new interpretation of the references necessitated by the amendment presented with new claims.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claim 30 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### **Conclusion**

Art Unit: 2614

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Jean W. Désir** whose telephone number is (703) 308-9571.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **John W. Miller**, can be reached at (703) 305-4795.

10. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231


or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

11. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306 0377.

**JWD**  
Nov. 6, 02

  
**JOHN MILLER**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600